

1	Charles C. Sipos (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) CSipos@perkinscoie.com		
2	Susan D. Fahringer (CA Bar No. 162978) SFahringer@perkinscoie.com		
3	PERKINS COIE LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900		
4	Seattle, WA 98101-3099 Telephone: (206) 359-8000		
5	Facsimile: (206) 359-9000		
6	Sunita B. Bali (CA Bar No. 274108)		
7	SBali@perkinscoie.com PERKINS COIE LLP		
8	4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400 San Francisco, CA 94111		
9	Telephone: (415) 344-7000 Facsimile: (25) 344-7050		
10			
11	Attorneys for Defendants Google Inc. and Google Payment Corporatio	ın	
12	Google Inc. and Google I ayment Corporatio	711	
13			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
16			
17	ALICE SVENSON, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No	. CV-13-04080-BLF
18	·	DEFENDANTS' CASE STATUS REPORT	
19	Plaintiff,	Judge:	Hon. Beth Labson Freeman
20	V.		
21	GOOGLE INC., a Delaware Corporation, and GOOGLE PAYMENT		
22	CORPORATION, a Delaware Corporation,		
23	Defendants.		
24			
25	Defendants Google, Inc. and Google Payment Corporation ("Defendants") respectfully		
26	submit this Case Status Report to apprise the Court of the status of <i>In re Google Inc. Privacy</i>		
27	Policy Litigation ("Privacy Policy Litigation"), No. 5-12-CV-01382-PSG (N.D. Cal.), and in		
28	DEFENDANTS' CASE STATUS REPORT No.CV-13-04080-BLF	-1-	
	LEGAL126945542.1		

Case5:13-cv-04080-BLF Document139 Filed07/22/15 Page2 of 2

1 response to Plaintiff's Case Status Report (Dkt. No. 138) (Jul. 21, 2015) concerning the recent 2 dismissal of *Privacy Policy Litigation*. 3 On July 1, 2015, Plaintiff Alice Svenson filed two motions in *Privacy Policy Litigation*: 4 (1) a motion to intervene in *Privacy Policy Litigation* and, (2) a motion to relate *Privacy Policy* 5 Litigation to this case. See Dkt. No. 129 (Jul. 1, 2015) (Plaintiff's Case Status Report advising of 6 motion to intervene and motion to relate cases). On July 15, 2015, and while Plaintiff's motion to 7 relate and motion to intervene were pending, Judge Grewal dismissed Privacy Policy Litigation 8 on the merits with prejudice, because plaintiffs in that action had not established any legally 9 cognizable injury sufficient to gain Article III standing. See Privacy Policy Litigation Dkt. No. 10 149 (Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Dismiss) (Jul. 15, 2015) at 8-12. In light of the 11 dismissal of *Privacy Policy Litigation*, Defendants agree that Plaintiff Svenson's motion to relate 12 and motion to intervene are moot. 13 Except as so stated above, Defendants otherwise disagree with the characterization in 14 Plaintiff's Case Status Report of the bases and rationale for Judge Grewal's dismissal of *Privacy* 15 Policy Litigation. 16 PERKINS COIE LLP DATED: July 22, 2015 17 By: /s/ Charles C. Sipos 18 Charles C. Sipos (*Pro Hac Vice*) CSipos@perkinscoie.com 19 Attorneys for Defendants 20 Google Inc. and Google Payment Corporation 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 DEFENDANTS' CASE STATUS REPORT No.CV-13-04080-BLF -2-

LEGAL126945542.1